



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/553,002 | 10/11/2005 | Yoon-Seok Hur | 5413YSH-1 | 1279 |
| 22442 | 7590 | 09/25/2006 | EXAMINER | |
| SHERIDAN ROSS PC 1560 BROADWAY SUITE 1200 DENVER, CO 80202 | | | NASH, BRIAN D | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 3721 | |

DATE MAILED: 09/25/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/553,002

Applicant(s)

HUR, YOON-SEOK

Examiner

Brian Nash

Art Unit

3721

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 October 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 October 2005 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/11/05.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Specification

2. The title of the invention is not descriptive and is therefore objected to. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. The following title is suggested: CIRCULAR SURGICAL STAPLER WITH DETACHABLE ANVIL.
3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Page 2 of the specifications introduces US 5,104,025 and continues to refer to element numbers and figures from this prior art reference; however, the element and figure numbers do not correspond to US 5,104,025. It appears that applicant has inadvertently provided an incorrect US patent number. It is also noted that the IDS makes reference to US 5,103,025 which is not directed to a surgical stapler or analogous art. Appropriate correction is required.

Drawings

4. Figures 4B, 5, 6A-C, 7 and 8 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

5. Claim 7 is objected to because of the following informalities: The term "thickness" is used and makes the claim confusing in lieu of the conventional use of this term. The Examiner suggests replacing

Art Unit: 3721

all instances of "thickness" with "length" in order to be consistent with a dimension in the longitudinal direction. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, there is insufficient antecedent basis for the terminology "the top". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

9. Claims 1-5, 8-9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US 5,533,661 to Main et al. Insofar as the invention is claimed, Main et al show the same circular stapler.

Art Unit: 3721

With respect to claim 1, a detachable anvil (100), a head section (60) having a head section cover (61), a cylindrical body (70) coupled to the head section, a recessed portion (decreased diameter section formed on the cylindrical body under the head section cover – see Fig. 1).

With respect to claim 2, the head section cover (61) has a circular plate shape (see Fig. 16).

With respect to claims 3-5, a cylindrical blade (69), a staple holder (68) having a plurality of slots (65), a push member (62) with a protruded portion (63), a support positioned under the push member and having a circular plate-shaped top (see Figs. 26-30 wherein Main et al shows an integral circular plate-shaped portion at the base of push member 62). The protruding portion (63) is formed thereon.

With respect to claim 8, the cylindrical body (70) has an arch shape (see Fig. 1).

With respect to claim 9, sections (64,72) are coupled and fixed to the recessed portion formed under the head section cover (61 – see Fig. 16).

With respect to claim 11, a trigger (86) provided at the lower end of the cylindrical body (70).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 6-7 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 5,533,661 to Main et al. As discussed above, Main et al show the invention substantially as claimed.

With respect to claim 6, Main et al disclose the anvil shaft to be made of stainless steel, but do not explicitly disclose the other portions of the stapler, specifically the circular plate-shaped top of the support member, to be made of steel. It is well known in the art to use stainless steel when making surgical staplers and would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure/modify the circular head of the support member, which is integral to the

Art Unit: 3721

push member, out of stainless steel, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice.

With respect to claim 7, Main et al disclose the claimed invention except for the head section cover to be set to a length of 15-18 mm. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to configure/modify the head section cover (61) since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Rose*, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955).

With respect to claim 10, Main et al disclose the claimed invention except for the shaft passing through the head section be set to a diameter of 1.0-1.5 mm. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to configure/modify the shaft passing through the head section (104) since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Rose*, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955).

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Refer to attachment (PTO-892) for notice of references cited and recommended for consideration based on their disclosure of limitations of the claimed invention.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian Nash whose telephone number is 571-272-4465. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Thursday from 8 a.m. to 6 p.m.

14. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rinaldi I. Rada can be reached at 571-272-4467. The official fax number for this Group is: 571-273-8300

15. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through

Art Unit: 3721

Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>.

Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

9/19/2006

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Brian Nash', written over a horizontal line.

Brian Nash